SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
AUG 8 1962
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No. 311

ROBERT SIDELL, MADELINE C. SIDELL, STANLEY SHOEMAKER, RICHARD BUSKER, *Petitioners,*

v.

EDWARD G. HILL, Regular Judge of the 26th Judicial District and Special Judge Designate of the 17th Judicial District, *Respondent.*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

JEROME M. ALPER
Suite 201, Premier Building
1725 Eye Street, N. W.
Washington 6, D. C.

MORRIS WEINTRAUB
321 York Street
Newport, Kentucky

THOMAS F. MARSHALL
507 McClure Building
Frankfort, Kentucky

Counsel for Petitioners

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

INDEX

	Page
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question Presented	2
Statutes Involved	2
Statement	3
How Federal Question Is Presented	5
Reasons For Granting the Writ	11
Conclusion	15
Appendix A—Statutes	1a
B—Opinions and Judgment Below	2a

CASES:

Akins v. *Texas*, 325 U.S. 398	12, 13
Ashcraft v. *Tennessee*, 322 U.S. 143	14
Chambers v. *Florida*, 309 U.S. 227	14
Commonwealth ex rel. Breckinridge, Attorney General v. *Wise*, (Ky.) 351 S.W. 2d 493	4
Craig v. *Harney*, 331 U.S. 367	13
Dial v. *Commonwealth*, 143 Ky. 118, 136 S.W. 139	9
Haley v. *Ohio*, 332 U.S. 596	14
Hawk v. *Olson*, 326 U.S. 271	14
Malinski v. *New York*, 324 U.S. 401	14
Napue v. *Illinois*, 306 U.S. 264	13
Niemotko v. *Maryland*, 340 U.S. 268	13
Norris v. *Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587	14
Philpot v. *Commonwealth*, 240 Ky. 289, 42 S.W. 2d 317	9
Pierre v. *Louisiana*, 306 U.S. 354	14
Rogers v. *Peck*, 195 U.S. 425	11
Scott v. *McNeal*, 154 U.S. 34	11, 12
Sidell v. *Hill*, (Ky.) 357 S.W. 2d 318	4
Williams v. *Kaiser*, 323 U.S. 471	14
Williams v. *United States*, 341 U.S. 97	12

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No.

ROBERT SIDELL, MADELINE C. SIDELL, STANLEY SHOEMAKER, RICHARD BUSKER, *Petitioners,*

v.

EDWARD G. HILL, Regular Judge of the 26th Judicial District and Special Judge Designate of the 17th Judicial District, *Respondent.*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Petitioners pray that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky entered in the above-entitled case on May 11, 1962.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Opinion of the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky (R. 56-63), printed in Appendix B hereto, *infra,* pp. 1a-10a, is reported in (Ky.) 357 S.W. 2d, 318.

JURISDICTION

The mandate of the Court of Appeals of the State of Kentucky was entered on May 11, 1962 (R. 64). The Supplemental Order holding that the Order of May 11, 1962, is not subject to rehearing or modification was entered on May 22, 1962, and dated May 25, 1962 (R. 65). The mandate and Supplemental Order are printed in Appendix B hereto, *infra,* pp. 10a-11a. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C., § 1257(3), since a right or privilege under the Constitution of the United States is specially claimed.

QUESTION PRESENTED

Has there been a denial of petitioners' rights to due process of law under the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution, where the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, under the circumstances of this case, prohibits a Special Judge, duly qualified and elected in accordance with statutory procedure governing the selection of a Special Judge upon disqualification of the Regular Judge, from sitting, and appoints a Special Judge of its own selection, in the absence of allegations or finding against the qualifications, integrity, or impartiality of the Special Judge?

STATUTES INVOLVED

The Constitutional provisions involved are United States Constitution, Amendment XIV, § 1 and Kentucky Constitution, § 110 and § 136. The statutory provision involved is K.R.S. 23.230. These Constitutional and statutory provisions are printed in Appendix A, *infra,* p. 1a.

STATEMENT

Petitioners were indicted by the Campbell County Special Grand Jury on September 13, 1961, being charged with certain violations of gambling and other laws. Several indictments were returned against the petitioners Robert and Madeline Sidell, charging the leasing or renting of a building alleged to have been used for gambling. Indictments were returned against the petitioners Shoemaker and Busker for alleged operating or conducting gambling operations and for doing business under an assumed name without filing the requisite certificate in the office of the Campbell County Clerk.

Upon the voluntary disqualification of the Judge to hear and determine motions and demurrers attacking the validity and sufficiency of the indictments returned against petitioners and others (R. 23), counsel below for petitioners, together with counsel for other persons against whom similar indictments had been returned, entered into a stipulation with the Commonwealth Attorney selecting the Honorable Louis Reuscher, a senior and respected member of the bar of the Campbell Circuit Court, to act as Special Judge for the purpose of hearing and determining all motions and demurrers directed to the several indictments (R. 24-26). Upon the basis of such stipulation, the Judge entered an order finding that Reuscher possessed all the legal qualifications necessary under the law and thereupon appointed said Reuscher as Special Judge and administered the Constitutional and statutory oaths as prescribed by law (R. 27). Thereafter, the Special Judge entered an order setting all pending motions for hearing on October 6, 1961 (R. 28).

Immediately thereafter, the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky filed as an original action with the Court of Appeals of Kentucky a petition for a writ of prohibition, among other things, against Reuscher sitting as Special Judge in connection with all of the indictments returned by the Special Grand Jury on September 13, 1961, including the indictments returned against petitioners. On October 5, 1961, the Court below entered a temporary writ of prohibition (R. 29), which was made permanent by an order entered on November 1, 1961 (R. 30-31). The Opinion of the Court is printed in Appendix B hereto, *infra*, pp. 11a-12a (Concurring Opinion omitted). *Commonwealth ex rel. Breckinridge, Attorney General* v. *Wise* (Ky.) 351 S.W. 2d 493.

Numerous of the persons indicted, not including petitioners, sought to intervene in those proceedings, but all of such motions for intervention were denied by the Order of November 1, 1961. The Chief Justice of the Court below entered an order on November 6, 1961, designating the respondent herein to preside over the Campbell Circuit Court for the purpose of disposing of all of the cases, as specified in said order, including respondent's cases. (R. 15-19).

In this background, petitioners filed as an original action in the Court below a petition for a writ of prohibition against Judge Hill, seeking to prohibit him from proceeding further in the trial of the indictments relating to petitioners and requesting an order adjudging that Reuscher is the duly elected Special Judge of the Campbell Circuit Court (R. 2-14). On May 11, 1962, the Court below entered an order denying the petition for a writ of prohibition and accompanied said order with its Opinion (R. 56-65). *Sidell* v. *Hill*

(Ky.) 357 S.W. 2d 318. The Court below on its own motion entered a supplemental order on May 22, 1962, precluding rehearing or modification of the order of May 11 (R. 65). On May 28, 1962, petitioners filed a motion with the Court below for an order abating and staying the order of May 11, 1962, pending application to this Honorable Court for a writ of certiorari (R. 69), and this motion was overruled by order entered June 5, 1962 (R. 77). On June 4, 1962, petitioners filed an application for stay, which was denied by Mr. Justice Stewart on June 6, 1962.

How Federal Question Is Presented

In the petition for writ of prohibition, petitioners properly raised the federal question, as follows: (R. 10)

> "Therefore, your petitioners respectfully state that the appointment of Edward G. Hill, the respondent in this action, as Special Judge of the 17th Judicial District, Campbell Circuit Court, by the Chief Justice of this Court on November 6, 1961, was contrary to the general law of the Commonwealth of Kentucky relative to the election of special judges, and that this action deprives them of the right to be heard before a court of competent jurisdiction properly constituted, and deprives them of procedural and substantive rights secured to them by Section 11 of the Constitution of Kentucky, and the due process clause and the equal protection of the laws clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America."

The federal question was presented in substantially the same language in petitioners' memorandum supporting the petition for writ of prohibition (R. 40).

The court below did not consider or pass upon the federal question thus presented.

This case has its genesis in hearings held in Frankfort in July 1961, by a Special Commissioner appointed by the Governor to consider ouster charges against certain peace officers of Newport and Campbell County. As a consequence of allegations made at these hearings, the Honorable Ray L. Murphy, Presiding Judge of the Campbell Circuit Court, convened a special session of the Grand Jury on August 14, 1961, which returned numerous indictments, including indictments against the Mayor of the City of Newport, the City Manager, three City Commissioners, and eight police officers for conspiracy to obstruct public justice.

Although grand jury proceedings are required to be conducted in secrecy, the press and other communication media throughout the State almost daily featured reports of the work of the Special Grand Jury and the Newport cases have become a major state-wide political issue involving the prestige and political prospects of the incumbent state administration.

Such a situation imposes a great responsibility on the Courts to prevent the petitioners from becoming pawns in a political contest and to assure that the trials of petitioners shall be conducted with the impartiality and fair play embodied in the due process concept. The Court of Appeals of Kentucky has failed to discharge this great responsibility and, by its own admission, appears to have misconceived its function. The attitude of the Court below is disclosed in the closing paragraph of its Opinion, which states as follows: (R. 63)

> "Some situations are so bad that they cannot be cured by half-measures. *Serious and distressing faults in our judicial and social system invoke the exercise of full capacities of those who are charged*

> *with the duty of discovering and correcting them.* This Court could easily have avoided that responsibility by pursuing the well-worn fork of the road as paved by Section 136 of the Constitution and its enabling Act, KRS 23.230, and by ignoring the realities of the situation. We chose instead to follow the path marked by Section 110 of the Constitution." (Emphasis supplied).

It is, thus, clear that the Court below has abdicated its judicial role and construed its function in this case to be the discovery and correction of faults in the judicial and social system. The prohibition against the duly selected special Judge Reuscher, and the designation of the respondent as Special Judge is a tangible manifestation of this misconception of function and necessarily raises grave doubts that the petitioners will receive the fair and impartial trial guaranteed to them by the Fourteenth Amendment. When an appellate court construes its function to be the discovery and correction of faults in the judicial and social system, due process is likely to be the first victim of the crusade.

Moreover, the Opinion of the court below gives rise to substantial doubts as to its soundness. Under Section 136 of the Constitution of Kentucky, the power to designate the method of selection of special judges is delegated to the General Assembly. Section 136 of the Constitution of Kentucky provides in relevant part as follows:

> "Special judges; legislature to provide for.—The general assembly shall provide by law for holding circuit court when, from any cause, the judge shall fail to attend, or if in attendance, cannot properly preside."

In KRS 23.230, the Legislature has exercised its constitutional responsibility and has provided in paragraph (1) thereof as follows:

> "When, from any cause, a judge of any circuit court, whether of continuous session or terms, fails to attend, or being in attendance, cannot properly preside in an action pending in the court, or if a vacancy occurs or exists in the office of circuit judge, or if either party files with the Clerk of the Court his affidavit that the judge will not afford him a fair and impartial trial, or will not impartially decide an application for a change of venue, the parties, by agreement, may elect one of the attorneys of the court to preside on the trial or hear the application, or hold the court for the occasion.... Any special judge so selected shall have all the powers and be subject to all the responsibilities of the regular judge of the court."

Upon the voluntary disqualification of the regular Judge (R. 23), Reuscher was properly selected by the parties as Special Judge (R. 24-26) and was duly appointed (R. 27) and entered upon the discharge of his duties as Special Judge (R. 28).

The court below based its decision on Section 110 of the Kentucky Constitution, which provides in pertinent part, as follows:

> "Said court shall have power to issue such writs as may be necessary to give it a general control of inferior jurisdictions."

The Court below in effect held that Section 136 of the Constitution of Kentucky, which vests in the Legislature the power to provide for the method of selecting special judges, and the enabling legislation thereunder (KRS 23.230), constitute an infringement on the common law power of the Court. The Court of Appeals

of Kentucky, however, is itself a creature of the Constitution and, therefore, only has the powers therein delegated. The power to provide the method for selecting a special judge, upon the disqualification of the regular judge, has been lodged by the Constitution with the Legislature.

In the long history of Kentucky, there are no reported cases and no indications that the Court of Appeals heretofore has ever claimed that its supervisory power over inferior tribunals granted by Section 110 of the Constitution of Kentucky empowers that court to override the provisions of Section 136 of the Kentucky Constitution. The contrary appears to be the case. The Court of Appeals long ago held that KRS 23.230 is mandatory, and special judges must be selected as required by that Act, and not otherwise. *Dial* v. *Commonwealth,* 143 Ky. 118, 136 S.W. 139. In the later case of *Philpot* v. *Commonwealth,* 240 Ky. 289, 42 S.W. 2d 317, the Court of Appeals interpreted KRS 23.230 as follows:

> ". . . But where there is authority conferred by law for the selection of a special judge by agreement and there has been in fact a mutuality of consent to his acting, the court is properly constituted. . . . The power of the legislature to provide for the manner of selecting special judges can hardly be questioned. . . ."

Under subsection (2) of KRS 23.230, the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals may not designate a special judge until the Clerk of the trial Court certifies the facts as to the existence of a vacancy. Subsection (2) provides as follows:

> "If the parties cannot agree upon an attorney as provided in subsection (1) of this section or if the

> regular judge determines that sufficient time is not available in which to ascertain if the parties can agree upon a member of the bar to act as judge, as provided in subsection (1) of this section, or if he determines that it is impracticable to attempt to obtain agreement because of the large number of parties to the action to be tried, or for any reason, the Clerk shall at once certify the facts to the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, who shall immediately designate a regular circuit judge, if one be available, and, if not, an attorney having the qualifications of a judge, to hold the court to try the action."

The Order of the Chief Justice designating the respondent as Special Judge (R. 15) on its face is erroneously predicated on the existence of a certificate from the Clerk of the trial Court. Such a certificate, however, has not been filed. This is established by a certificate of the Clerk of the Campbell Circuit Court (R. 20-22) which states, among other things, the following:

> "9. The affiant, as Clerk of the Campbell Circuit Court, hereby certifies that she has never, pursuant to KRS 23.230, or any other section of law, certified to the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, that the parties to the aforesaid actions cannot agree upon an attorney as provided by subsection (1) of KRS 23.230, but states affirmatively that, as aforesaid, the Commonwealth Attorney and the attorney representing the defendants in the above cases, did stipulate and agree upon Hon. Louis Reuscher as Special Judge in said cases for the purposes set forth in the stipulation referred to above and attached hereto as Exhibit B."

Even if it be assumed, *arguendo,* that the court below had the power to set aside the designation by the par-

ties of Reuscher and to appoint the respondent as Special Judge, there is no factual basis for such action. The Court below predicated its Opinion on the "disturbed" conditions in Campbell County (R. 60-61). The Court's Opinion stated "that there were few public officials charged with law enforcement in Campbell County who were not under close scrutiny during most of the year 1961", although the Court concedes that many of "the officials were completely absolved from even a suggestion of wrong doing, . . .". (R. 61).

The significant fact, however, is that Reuscher was not a public official and was not in any wise involved or implicated with the problems of law enforcement. Reuscher, as a matter of fact, is a respected senior member of the bar of the Campbell Circuit Court, fully qualified to serve as a Judge. No allegations were made in the case at bar, or in any of the related proceedings, against the integrity or qualifications of Reuscher, or that he had any interest of any kind in the defendants or the public officials charged with malfeasance, which would affect his impartiality. The Court below has made no adverse findings with respect to Reuscher. Under these circumstances, there is lacking the rational relationship between the facts and the conclusions of the Court required to clothe the action of the Court with that degree of reasonableness required by the concept of due process.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. The case presents an issue of importance under the Federal Constitution. A basic element of a fair trial is that there must be a competently constituted court. See *Scott* v. *McNeal*, 154 U.S. 34, 46; see also, *Rogers* v. *Peck*, 195 U.S. 425, 435. The observation

by Mr. Justice Douglas, that "it is the right of the accused to be tried by a regularly constituted court, not by a kangaroo court" succinctly states the federal issue presented. *Williams* v. *United States,* 341 U.S. 97, 101. In the *Scott* case, *supra,* at 46, the court stated as follows:

> "the words 'due process of law,' when applied to judicial proceedings, as was said by Mr. Justice Field, speaking for this court, 'mean a course of legal proceedings according to those rules and principles which have been established in our systems of jurisprudence for the protection and enforcement of private rights. To give such proceedings any validity, there must be a tribunal competent by its constitution—that is, by the law of its creation—to pass upon the subject matter of the suit; . . .' Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714, 733."

Certiorari has been granted by this Court for alleged denial of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment because of the manner in which the trial judge was designated. *Akins* v. *Texas,* 325 U.S. 398. Although upon review, the Court held on the facts of that case that there had been no infringement of federal rights, the case at bar is distinguishable on its facts and presents a case of infringement of federal rights.

In *Akins,* the Texas Constitution empowered the Governor to fill court vacancies occasioned by death. A statute of Texas provided for the assignment of a special judge by the Presiding Judge of a specified Judicial District to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the regularly chosen occupant. The trial judge had died, the Governor had failed to exercise his power of appointment, and the Presiding Judge appointed a Special Judge.

In *Akins*, the case, on this point, turned solely on the construction of the Texas statute providing for appointments by the Presiding Judge. The State Court held the statute constitutional on the grounds that the statute merely provided for the functioning of courts under assigned judges until the vacancy was filled by the Governor. On this basis for the decision, this Court concluded that no federal issue was involved.

In the case at bar, the situation is materially different. The Court below has removed a special judge, who had been duly selected and qualified, and replaced him with a special judge of the Court's own choice. This was done without any adverse allegations or findings with respect to the qualifications integrity, or ability of Reuscher to conduct a fair trial.

In view of the manifest and unavoidable political overtones of a case such as this, the switching of trial judges becomes a matter of grave concern and imperils the petitioners' rights to a fair trial. This Court has said that it has the duty to make its own independent examination of the record when Federal Constitutional deprivations are alleged and that it is not bound by the conclusions of the lower courts in such cases. *Napue* v. *Illinois*, 360 U.S. 264; *Niemotko* v. *Maryland*, 340 U.S. 268, 271; *Craig* v. *Harney*, 331 U.S. 367, 373-374. This case warrants such independent examination.

2. The issue presented in the case at bar is not of significance only for this case, or for Kentucky, but presents a problem of nationwide significance. Many states, as does Kentucky, have constitutional or legislative provisions governing the selection of special judges to try criminal proceedings in the event of the disqualification of the regular judge. Similarly, appel-

late courts generally have supervisory jurisdiction over inferior tribunals, either by constitutional or legislative provisions or by common law doctrines. If the doctrine of the case at bar were established there would be a dual but uncertain basis for the selection of special judges. Such an area of uncertainty would be an invitation to hand-pick judges for criminal trials of wide public interest. If the federal constitutional guarantee of due process of law is to be preserved in this area, this Court will have to supply essential constitutional guidelines not now existing.

The dearth of authority on this problem and the importance of the problem on a national basis commends this case to the Court for review.

3. The decision below appears to be in conflict with the principles constituting a fair trial enunciated over the years by this Court. It has, thus, been held, among others, that confessions obtained by duress, denial of right to counsel, exclusion from the jury panel of persons because of race or color are matters which deny those charged with crime of a fair trial. See *Haley* v. *Ohio*, 332 U.S. 596; *Malinski* v. *New York*, 324 U.S. 401; *Hawk* v. *Olson*, 326 U.S. 271; *Williams* v. *Kaiser*, 323 U.S. 471; *Ashcraft* v. *Tennessee*, 322 U.S. 143; *Chambers* v. *Florida*, 309 U.S. 227, 229; *Pierre* v. *Louisiana*, 306 U.S. 354, 358; *Norris* v. *Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587, 590. The judge is certainly as important to a fair trial as are the jury, the right to counsel, and protection against unlawful confessions. They all have in common the protection of the rights of the accused to a fair trial.

In the case at bar, the Court below, in a radical departure from precedent, has, in a case of state-wide

political significance, removed a duly selected special judge and replaced him with a special judge of its own choice in the absence of any disqualifying allegations or findings with respect to the special judge removed. Such a situation patently is characterized by that judicial arbitrariness, which deprives litigants of the fair trial guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

JEROME M. ALPER
Counsel for Petitioners

Dated: August , 1962

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

AMENDMENT XIV

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

CONSTITUTION OF KENTUCKY

§ 110. JURISDICTION OF COURT OF APPEALS; CONTROL OF INFERIOR COURTS. The Court of Appeals shall have appellate jurisdiction only, which shall be co-extensive with the State, under such restrictions and regulations not repugnant to this Constitution, as may from time to time be prescribed by law. Said court shall have power to issue such writs as may be necessary to give it a general control of inferior jurisdictions.

• • • • •

§ 136. SPECIAL JUDGES OF CIRCUIT COURTS. The General Assembly shall provide by law for holding Circuit Courts when, from any cause, the Judge shall fail to attend, or, if in attendance, cannot properly preside.

KENTUCKY REVISED STATUTES

SECTION 23.230

(1) When, from any cause, a judge of any circuit court, whether of continuous session or terms, fails to attend, or being in attendance cannot properly preside in an action pending in the court, or if a vacancy occurs or exisits in the office of circuit judge, or if either party files with the

clerk of the court his affidavit that the judge will not afford him a fair and impartial trial, or will not impartially decide an application for a change of venue, the parties, by agreement, may elect one of the attorneys of the court to preside on the trial or hear the application, or hold the court for the occasion. . . . Any special judge so selected shall have all the powers and be subject to all the responsibilities of the regular judge of the court.

(2) If the parties cannot agree upon an attorney as provided in subsection (1) of this section or if the regular judge determines that sufficient time is not available in which to ascertain if the parties can agree upon a member of the bar to act as judge, as provided in subsection (1) of this section, or if he determines that it is impracticable to attempt to obtain agreement because of the large number of parties to the action to be tried, or for any reason, the clerk shall at once certify the facts to the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, who shall immediately designate a regular circuit judge, if one be available, and, if not, an attorney having the qualifications of a judge, to hold the court or try the action.

APPENDIX B

COURT OF APPEALS OF KENTUCKY

IN COURT OF APPEALS

ROBERT SIDELL, ET AL., APPELLANTS

v.

EDWARD G. HILL, SPECIAL JUDGE DESIGNATE OF THE 17th JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPELLEE

DENYING WRIT OF PROHIBITION

Opinion of the Court by Judge Moreman

On the 13th day of September 1961, after an intense investigation of the condition of vice and crime, the Grand

Jury of Campbell County returned many indictments. By order dated November 6, 1961, the Chief Justice of this Court appointed Honorable Edward G. Hill, who had presided over the Grand Jury, as special judge to preside over the Campbell Circuit Court during trial of persons charged by the indictments rendered by that Grand Jury.

Four of the persons indicted, Robert Sidell, Madeline C. Sidell, Stanley Shoemaker and Richard Busker, have petitioned this Court to set a side and withdraw its order of November 6, 1961, and to issue a writ prohibiting Judge Hill from trying the petitioners under the indictments against them and, further, to adjudge that the Honorable Louis Reuscher had been duly selected to hear pleadings directed at the validity and sufficiency of said indictments.

This petition for a writ of prohibition has the quality of a petition for rehearing in an ordinary case in that the problems we are requested to decide have heretofore been determined by us. In order to reconsider the actions taken by this Court a restatement of fact is required.

On September 15, 1961, the Honorable Ray L. Murphy, the regular judge of the Campbell Circuit Court, while exercising a sound sense of propriety, entered an order which reads.

> "It being the opinion of Ray L. Murphy, the regular judge of the Criminal Common Law and Equity Division of the Campbell Circuit Court, that it would be improper that he preside as judge to hear and determine motions and demurrers attacking the validity or sufficiency of indictments returned by the recent Grand Jury impaneled on August 15, 1961, and which concluded its session and adjourned on September 13, 1961:
>
> "Now, Therefore, the regular judge removes himself from said hearings on said motions and demurrers, and vacates the Bench for said purpose; and in the

event that the attorneys representing the several movants who are named in said indictments, and the attorney representing the Commonwealth of Kentucky, are unable to agree upon the appointment of a local attorney possessing all the necessary qualifications as special judge, this order of vacation shall be properly certified by the Clerk of the Campbell Circuit Court to the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals for the appointment of a special judge to perform the duties relative to the hearing and determination of the aforesaid motions and demurrers."

On the same day, September 15, 1961, a stipulation designating a special judge was filed under KRS 23.230. This stipulation was signed by the commonwealth's attorney, Hon. William J. Wise, in behalf of the commonwealth, and various attorneys in behalf of the defendants indicted, including the attorneys for petitioners in this case. It reads in part:

"It is stipulated and agreed by and between William J. Wise, Commonwealth's Attorney, and the undersigned attorneys for the respective defendants who have filed motions and demurrers attacking the validity of the above styled indictments, and attorney or attorneys who have indicated to the Commonwealth's Attorney and the Court that they propose to file demurrers and motions attacking the sufficiency and validity of said indictments; that Hon. Louis Reuscher, an attorney of this court, be and he is hereby selected to act as Special Judge herein for the purpose of hearing and determining the above motions and demurrers, and entering all orders relating thereto which he may adjudge to be meet and proper * * *"

On October 26, 1961, an original action was filed in this Court styled Commonwealth of Ky. ex rel John B. Breckinridge, Attorney General v. William J. Wise, Common-

wealth's Attorney, Ray L. Murphy, Judge, and Louis Reuscher, Special Judge—all of the 17th Judicial District.

Several officials of the City of Newport who also were under indictment attempted to intervene in this action for the purpose of sustaining the selection of Hon. Louis Reuscher as special judge. On November 1, 1961, this Court entered an order in which it was recited that all motions for intervention were overruled. The case was dismissed as to Commonwealth's Attorney Wise on the ground that he was not a judicial officer, and Reuscher was prohibited and enjoined from sitting as special judge. Regular Judge Murphy was disqualified as a matter of course to hear or try any of the indictments resulting from the Grand Jury above described. The opinion was filed in the case on November 22, 1961, (Ky. 351 S.W. (2) 493). It does not assign in detail the reasons for issuing a permanent writ of prohibition—the simple fact remains that the writ was issued. Judge Milliken filed a concurring opinion which sets forth a firm basis for the action of the Court, saying:

> "However, we believe it well to point out that this Court, like the highest court in any common law jurisdiction, has such supervisory powers, derived from the common law of England, as it may find essential for it to assure the effective administration of justice within this jurisdiction. 14 A. Jur., Courts, Sections 264-274. The common law history of this development in England and the United States was traced by the Supreme Court in 1838 in Kendall v. United States, 12 Pet. 524, 9 L. Ed. at 1181. Section 110 of our Constitution is an express recognition of these supervisory powers and not a limitation of them."

Section 110 of the Constitution referred to in the above opinion, which deals with the jurisdiction and the powers

of the Court of Appeals, contains this specific delegation of authority:

> "Said Court shall have power to issue such writs as may be necessary to give it a general control of inferior jurisdictions."

We will not attempt here to summarize the hundreds of cases, as evidenced by the opinions of this Court, wherein that power has been exercised, but we think it is a fair deduction from the reasoning in all of them that the Court has jealously guarded its right to do those things which are required to obtain fair and just administration of judicial duties in all courts of this commonwealth.

In the case under consideration it is argued that the appointment of Edward G. Hill as Special Judge of the Campbell Circuit Court was irregular and contrary to the statute relating to the appointment of Special Circuit Judges, and it is emphasized that Section 136 of the Constitution states:

> "The general assembly shall provide by law for holding circuit courts when, from any cause, the judge shall fail to attend, or, if in attendance cannot properly preside."

Under that section the general assembly enacted KRS 23.230 which, in substance, provides that when, from any cause, the circuit judge cannot properly preside the parties may by agreement elect one of the attorneys of the court to perform the regular judge's function and, if the parties cannot agree or if the regular judge determines that sufficient time is not available in which to ascertain if the parties can agree upon a special judge or if the regular judge determines that it is impractical to attempt to obtain an agreement because of the large number of parties to the action, the clerk of the lower court shall certify these facts

to the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals who shall designate a special judge to act.

The petitioner urged that after the regular circuit judge disqualified himself and the petitioners through their attorneys entered into an agreement with the commonwealth's attorney and selected the Hon. Louis Reuscher as special judge, the Chief Justice had no power or authority under the statute and under Section 136 of the Constitution to appoint Judge Hill to act as special judge.

We suppose that the members of an appellate court are not required to be less informed about matters of general public intelligence than is the average person and are granted the right to know when a certain area of their own state has become disturbed and is in a state of turmoil regardless of whether the condition was brought about as the result of some natural phenomena such as fire, windstorms, et cetera, or is self-induced because of malfeasance or misfeasance on the part of some of the officials of the community. The intense publicity through all media of communications concerning conditions in Campbell County was so great that this Court certainly was well within its rights in concluding that these conditions warranted investigation by a grand jury and trial of indictments, if any ensued, under a person who, up to the time of the initiation of the corrective action, was entirely remote from and not in any way subject to the stimuli of preconceived impressions, however slight. This Court charged as it is by Section 110 of the Constitution with the heavy responsibility of overseeing all inferior courts is not always restricted to the narrow field of vision seen only by judicial eyes. In addition, this Court, before the time of the appointment of Judge Hill, had been informed through its own records of the tumultuous conditions which were disturbing the people of Campbell County. As early as August 7, 1961, a petition for a writ of prohibition was filed in this Court and some of the members were fully informed about the grave

happenings. Although facts are not stated in detail in the opinion, our conclusions may be found in Commonwealth v. Wise, Ky., 351 S.W. (2) 491. See also Commonwealth v. Murphy, Judge, Ky., 351 S.W. (2) 513.

It is disclosed by the proceedings before us and as a matter of general information that there were few public officials charged with law enforcement in Campbell County who were not under close scrutiny during most of the year 1961. In many cases the suspicions were groundless and the officials were completely absolved from even a suggestion of wrongdoing, but at that time it was certain that all parties, whether guilty or innocent, were under suspicion and the impartial administration of justice in the county was in high question. This Court concluded that all persons could best be served by a judge from a distant area in the state who was completely free to act—unhampered by past impressions concerning the situation or old associations or even familiar memories. These were cases for a stranger to try.

Counsel argue that the appointment of Judge Hill was not in strict accordance with the method set forth by the legislature in KRS 23.230. This Court in many instances has accepted guidance from that branch of the government in areas in which there was considerable doubt as to whether it had full power to act. This resulted from the fact that we must always bear in mind that judicial encroachment—under constitutional doctrine—is as repulsive as similar action by the legislative or executive branches. Therefore in the attempt to maintain the delicate balance of power and duties between the three departments of government we have not resisted infringement upon vested power unless that impingement was clear and certainly defined.

Here we are faced with an act of the general assembly under the right granted by Section 136 of the Constitution. The act set out a series of conditions which should exist

before the Chief Justice is empowered to designate a special judge. We are also faced with the enormous responsibility placed upon us under Section 110 of the Constitution which reaffirmed and gave to this Court the ancient common law power of a supreme court to control the actions of an inferior court and its officers when conditions warranted it. In 14 Am. Jur. Courts, Section 264, it is written:

> "The superintending control over inferior tribunals possessed by courts in various states in this country 'is of ancient inception, and relates back to and has its origin in the power exercised by the King's Bench in England.' The exercise of this supervisory power is 'recognized by the common law' apart from constitutional and statutory provisions. According to the common law, superior courts are entitled to a general superintendence over all subordinate courts for the purpose of keeping them within their prescribed sphere and of preventing usurpation. This common-law power has been carried into the Constitutions and statutes of many states, which directly give to superior courts a general superintending control over inferior courts of law and equity."

Here again it must be stated that this was not a simple procedure in a single case as is anticipated by KRS 23.230, but involved the general administration of justice in that jurisdiction. The circumstances required action by this Court.

Some situations are so bad that they cannot be cured by half-measures. Serious and distressing faults in our judicial and social system invoke the exercise of full capacities of those who are charged with the duty of discovering and correcting them. This Court could easily have avoided that responsibility by pursuing the well-worn fork of the road as paved by Section 136 of the Constitution and its enabling act, KRS 23.230, and by ignoring the realities of

the situation. We chose instead to follow the path marked by Section 110 of the Constitution.

The petition for a writ of prohibition is denied.

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT
Thomas F. Marshall, Frankfort, Ky.
(Funk, Chancellor & Marshall)
Morris Weintraub, Newport, Ky.

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE
Edward G. Hill, *Pro Se.*

Orders—Kentucky Court of Appeals

Spring Term—May 11, 1962

In Court of Appeals

ROBERT SIDELL, et al., *Petitioners*

v.

EDWARD G. HILL, Special Judge Designate of the 17th Judicial District, *Respondent*

The Court being sufficiently advised, delivered an opinion herein, and it is considered that the motion of petitioners for writ of prohibition be and the same is denied; which is ordered to be certified.

It is further considered that the respondent recover of the petitioners, his cost herein expended.

Orders—Kentucky Court of Appeals

Spring Term—May 25, 1962

Supplemental Order

ROBERT SIDELL, et al., *Petitioners*

v.

EDWARD G. HILL, Special Judge Designate of the 17th Judicial District, *Respondent*

It appearing to the Court that its order of May 11, 1962, denying a writ of prohibition in this proceeding requires

clarification with respect to its effective date and the availability of further consideration by way of petition for rehearing or modification, it is now ordered, upon the Court's own motion, that said order be considered effective and final as of its date of entry, May 11, 1962, and not subject to rehearing or modification.

Entered this May 22, 1962.

(signed) J. B. MILLIKEN
Acting Chief Justice

COURT OF APPEALS OF KENTUCKY

In Court of Appeals

No. F-37-61

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY EX REL. JOHN B. BRECKINRIDGE, ATTORNEY GENERAL, *Petitioner*

v.

WILLIAM J. WISE, COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY, 17th JUDICIAL DISTRICT, ET AL., *Respondents*

Opinion of the Court by Chief Justice Bird
(Rendered November 22, 1961)

PROHIBITION GRANTED AS TO THE REGULAR JUDGE AND SPECIAL JUDGE AND DENIED AS TO THE COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY

This is an original action in this Court. The Commonwealth seeks to prohibit Ray L. Murphy, Regular Judge of the Campbell Circuit Court and Louis Reuscher, Special Judge of that court, from officiating in the trial of certain penal actions pending on the docket of that court.

The Commonwealth likewise seeks to prohibit William J. Wise, Commonwealth's Attorney, from performing any of his official duties connected with or related to those actions.

The regular judge and the special judge having filed no response to the charges contained in the complaint, it is the judgment of this Court that they and each of them be prohibited from sitting in the trials of those cases or in any hearing thereunto pertaining.

The Commonwealth's Attorney has responded and moved this Court to dismiss the action as to him upon the grounds that he is not a judicial officer and that a writ of prohibition cannot therefore be directed to him from this Court.

Under the authority of Commonwealth v. Wise, Ky., S.W. 2d , rendered November 17, 1961, being appeal No. V-66-61, we must sustain the motion of Mr. Wise to dismiss as to him. See also Moreland v. Helm, Ky., S.W. 2d , rendered October 6, 1961. Prohibition is granted as to the regular judge and special judge as heretofore stated. Prohibition is denied as to the Commonwealth's Attorney and the petition as to him is hereby dismissed.

It will be noted that this action was handled temporarily by order of November 1, 1961.

ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER:
John B. Breckinridge
Attorney General
Frankfort, Kentucky

ATTORNEY FOR RESPONDENTS:
William J. Wise
Commonwealth's Attorney
Courthouse
Newport, Kentucky